



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Paper No. 7

Serial Number: 734188
Filing Date: 7-22-91
Appellant(s): Ole Nilssen

MAILED

93-1732
Ole Nilssen
For Appellant

NOV 30 1992

GROUP 2500

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

RECEIVED

FEB 24 1993

BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

MAILED

Serial No. 734188

-2-

NOV 30 1992

Art Unit 2502

GROUP 2500

This is in response to appellant's brief on appeal filed Oct 17 92.

(1) Status of claims.

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(2) Status of Amendments After Final.

There has been no amendment filed subsequent to the examiner's final rejection.

(3) Summary of invention.

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Issues.

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(5) Grouping of claims.

All the claims at issue constitute only a single group, namely claims 1-14.

Serial No. 734188
Art Unit 2502

-3-

MAILED
NOV 30 1992
GROUP 2500

The rejection of claims 1-14 stand or fall together because appellant's brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims does not stand or fall together. See 37 C.F.R. 1.192(c)(5).

(6) Claims appealed.

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(7) Prior Art of record.

The following is a listing of the prior art-of record relied upon in the rejection of claims under appeal.

Number	Name	Date
5,019,938	Sridharan	5-28-91

(8) New prior art.

No new prior art has been applied in this examiner's answer.

(9) Grounds of rejection.

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims.

Serial No. 734188

-4-

Art Unit 2502

MAILED

NOV 30 1992

GROUP 2500

The final rejection of 5-19-92 forms the ground of rejection which are applicable to the appealed claims.

(10) New ground of rejection.

This Examiner's Answer does not contain any new ground of rejection.

(11) Response to argument.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the statement under "Discussion of issue on appeal" in the brief and the following are the areas of disagreement and the reasons why:

Claims 1-14 simply claim a ballast housing structure and its exterior wall design. The ballast consists of a housing, a transformer and its circuitry. This type of ballast housing structure is well known in the prior art as shown by the relied upon patent to Sridharan et al, comprising a rectangular housing structure, a transformer and related circuitry. The ballast circuit enclosure of Sridharan et al consists of first and second transformer sections including recesses in the floor panel within which are accommodated the coils of the transformer. It is just a matter of design consideration to have a different transformer such as a "leakage transformer" in place of the two transformers of Sridharan et al.

Serial No. 734188

-5- MAILED

Art Unit 2502

NOV 30 1992

GROUP 2500

Concerning the orientation of the core with respect to the plane of the bottom wall of the housing, it should be noted that the position of the transformers with their main plane parallel or perpendicular to the long axis is just a matter of housing design consideration.

In summary,

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Ali Neyzari

11-24-92



ROBERT J. PASCAL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 252